

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS	§	
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:12-cv-832-JRG-RSP
	§	(Lead Case)
	§	
SPRINT NEXTEL CORPORATION,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS	§	
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:13-cv-259-JRG-RSP
	§	
SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS	§	
AMERICA, LLC,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS	§	
TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:13-cv-258-JRG-RSP
	§	
APPLE INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	

ORDER

In accordance with the Oral Orders made at the June 16, 2014 Motion Hearing (the “Hearing”), the Court rules as follows.

For the reasons assigned at the Hearing, the Court **DENIES** MTEL’s Opposed Motion for Leave to File Amended Infringement Contentions (Dkt. 145). MTEL’s request to add contentions regarding new functionality and/or products is denied because the Court finds that the burden imposed on Defendant Apple is too high to justify the addition of these new products and/or functionality at this late stage, and that any issues arising from those newly developed items must be brought in a different suit. MTEL’s request to add a number of products that existed in their current forms at the time the suit is filed is denied because the Court finds MTEL did not exercise sufficient diligence in adding those products to the case.

For the reasons assigned at the Hearing, the Court **GRANTS IN PART** MTEL’s Motion to Compel Production of Documents from Defendant Apple, Inc. (Dkt. 168). Apple is **ORDERED** to produce within 10 days of the hearing all of Ms. Julie Davis’s expert reports from the cases discussed at the hearing. Apple may redact confidential third party license information. Apple may also redact other confidential third party information but must note that such information is not license related. Apple must simultaneously deliver an unredacted paper version of the expert reports to Chambers for *in camera* review, in order to expedite the resolution of any objections relating to the breadth of redactions.

The following Motions are **FOUND AS MOOT** in accordance with either the Parties’ prior agreements or prior and subsequent rulings of the Court:

- MTEL’s Opposed Motion for Extension of Time to File Claim Construction Brief (Dkt. 113).

- MTEL's Emergency Motion to Compel Samsung to Comply with its Discovery Obligations (Dkt. 133).
- MTEL's Emergency Motion to Expedite the Motion to Compel Samsung to Comply with its Discovery Obligations (Dkt. 134).
- MTEL's Opposed Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery and Submission of Expert Witness Reports (Dkt. 146).
- MTEL's Motion to Expedite MTEL's Motion for an Extension of Fact Discovery and Submission of Expert Witness Reports (Dkt. 148).
- MTEL's Supplemental Motion and Supplement to MTel's Reply in Support of its Motion to Shorten Time (Dkt. 155).
- MTEL's Opposed Motion to Amend/Correct the Docket Control Order (Dkt. 173).

SIGNED this 17th day of June, 2014.


ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE